

SECRET

DDI #05933-84

17 October 1984

NOTE TO: Director of Central Intelligence  
Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

FROM : Deputy Director for Intelligence

SUBJECT: Interdisciplinary Analysis

1. In a couple of recent reports on DI offices, the Inspector General has expressed concern over a dearth of multidisciplinary analysis. Because I was concerned by this, some two months ago I asked the Product Evaluation Staff to look at the Directorate's entire production of formal research in the last year to assess the degree to which we were carrying out one of the original objectives of the reorganization -- the production of multidisciplinary analysis. [redacted]

25X1

2. The resulting PES study is attached. The bottom line conclusion is that 47% of the Directorate's work was interdisciplinary to a substantial degree, nearly 40% of the papers were entirely appropriate as single disciplinary papers in view of the subject matter, and some 15% showed room for improvement in this area. [redacted]

25X1

3. Moreover, the trends are in the right direction. An assessment last year of interdisciplinary content of the papers produced by the five regional offices and OGI found 36% to be interdisciplinary to a reasonable degree; this year, 50% of the products of those offices was interdisciplinary. We will obviously keep working on the 15% where there is room for improvement and looking for other opportunities as well to expand interdisciplinary analysis but I think the PES study shows that three years after the reorganization we have made enormous progress since 1981 and are headed in the right direction. [redacted]

25X1

[redacted]  
Robert M. Gates

25X1

Attachment:  
As Stated

SECRET

25X1

DDI #05933-84  
17 October 1984

SUBJECT: Interdisciplinary Analysis

DISTRIBUTION: (all copies with attachment)

0 - DCI  
1 - DDCI  
1 - ER  
1 - DDI Registry  
1 - DDI Chrono

DDI/RMGates

25X1

INTERDISCIPLINARY ANALYSIS IN THE  
DIRECTORATE OF INTELLIGENCE:  
A Status Report

Summary

The Directorate of Intelligence (DI) is producing a healthy and growing amount of interdisciplinary analysis. Of 537 formal papers produced during the past year, the Product Evaluation Staff (PES) found that 252 (47 percent) were interdisciplinary to a substantial degree when submitted to the DI front office for review. Another 78 papers (15 percent) showed room for improvement on this score. Twenty papers were remanded by the DI front office at least in part because they were deficient in this regard; almost all were integrated, interdisciplinary papers when they emerged. And PES identified an additional 58 papers that we believe would have benefited from injection of more analysis from the perspective of other disciplines. The remaining 207 papers (almost 40 percent of the total) were, in our opinion, entirely appropriate as single-discipline papers in view of the subject matter and intensive research efforts underway (see Table 1).

Moreover, the reorganization apparently is having the desired impact. Our assessment last year of the interdisciplinary content of the papers produced by the five regional offices and OGI found slightly over a third to be interdisciplinary to a reasonable degree; this year, our data put exactly half the products of those offices in the interdisciplinary category (see Table 2). Within this group, the figures for OGI show the greatest improvement, while ALA shows the highest proportion this year. Both EURA and NESAS show good progress. The mix of OEA output is about the same for both years, while the data for SOVA indicate a decline both in the quantity and share of its product that we would characterize as interdisciplinary. (In all these comparisons between the two years, however, be aware that last year's survey was less intensive and that the turnover of personnel in PES may mean that we are applying different standards.)

The mix of interdisciplinary papers is quite broad. Of the 252 formal papers that were interdisciplinary when forwarded for review, 174 involved combinations of the three strains of analysis we most often think of--political, economic and military. In this group, political economy papers were the most common, accounting for almost half the total. Political/military papers were next, but 45 papers drew together all three disciplines; these most often involved Third World countries. Another 78 papers involved different combinations of two or three disciplines--geography, economics, military or technical analysis, politics, psychology, or biography (see Table 3).

SECRET

SECRET

This is not to say that there is no room for further improvement. As noted above, 20 papers were singled out by the DI front office as having serious deficiencies in the disciplinary mix, and PES identified 58 others where we thought the offices had missed opportunities for improving the product by bringing in more input from other disciplines (see Table 4). This amounts to about 15 percent of the total sample. Moreover, there were a fair number of instances where the research strategy made the paper defensible but where the strategy itself appeared to us to be somewhat questionable. And we gave credit for interdisciplinary work even when we thought it could have been better integrated.

We found the largest number of missed opportunities in OIA, which is no surprise, given that it is in the early stages of transition to a more sophisticated, broader-ranging treatment of issues. Many of the OIA papers we included as problems in regard to interdisciplinary mix might as well--or better--be described as merely needing more analysis and perspective. That is, we found many of them deficient in spelling out the military implications of work on purely military topics. In other cases, however, we thought OIA should be reaching out farther for political context.

Of the offices that traditionally have done integrated, all-source analysis, we found that NESa and OEA were missing chances to do integrated work more often than the others. And our data somewhat understate OSWR's difficulty in dealing with the policy relevance of its research. The DDI and ADDI intervened frequently to press OSWR on specific papers, but we did not count those papers as "problems" because they were not actually remanded for revision and a second review.

Directorate-wide, the most common dimension missing was the political one. Of the 78 papers singled out as "problems" for the purpose of this study, 46 seemed to need more on the political context and/or consequences (domestic politics, impact on foreign policy, impact on arms control stance). OIA accounts for much of this, but even leaving OIA out we found that political content was missing in over half the "problem" cases. Military content was least often the problem, but here again OIA showed the highest incidence of omissions. Leaving OIA aside, we identified only eight instances in which we or the DI front office felt that the important military issues had been neglected.

There does appear to be a direct correlation between interdisciplinary papers and the multiauthor, multioffice approach. Cause and effect are murky, since a broadly-conceived paper is likely to involve more individuals and offices than a narrowly-cast one. And some of the best examples we found of well-integrated interdisciplinary work were produced by a single author in a single office. But the data are compelling. About two-thirds of the papers

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

singled out as deficient were produced by a single author (and a slightly larger share by a single office). The interdisciplinary papers were seldom produced by a single author or a single office. Over two-thirds of them involved more than one author; 80 percent were joint projects or involved a contribution from another office substantial enough to be acknowledged on the PRR and title page.

The mix of single-discipline papers is also worth noting. Of the 207 papers we judged appropriate as single-discipline products, 30 percent were political; economic and military topics accounted for about a quarter each; scientific and technical papers came to about a fifth of the total; and the remainder were geographic and biographic. OGI, SOVA, and OEA showed a fairly high proportion of economic papers, SOVA was expectedly heavy on military papers, OSWR concentrated on science and technology, and OIA concentrated almost entirely on military and technical reports. ALA, EURA, and NESA, on the other hand, published a substantial number of political papers and relatively few single-discipline papers on economic or military issues (see Table 5).

Although we also reviewed typescripts, we found very few that struck us as having problems with the disciplinary mix. Some commentary will be found in the office-by-office detail at annex, but we have not attempted to summarize the data.

SECRET

Table 1

DI Formal Papers  
October 1983 - Early September 1984

	<u>Total Number Reviewed</u>	<u>Interdisciplinary When Submitted</u>		<u>Appropriate as Single Discipline</u>		<u>Some Problems with Disciplinary Content</u>	
		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
ALA	53	36	68	10	19	7	13
EUR	57	30	53	21	37	6	11
NESA	73	29	40	31	42	13	18
OE	59	28	47	20	34	11	19
SOVA	62	15	24	42	68	5	8
OGI	100	64	64	29	29	7	7
OSWR	48	11	23	30	62	7	15
OIA	58	19	33	21	36	18	31
OCR	27	20	74	3	11	4	15
	<u>537</u>	<u>252</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>207</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>15</u>

SECRET

Table 2  
Changes in Interdisciplinary Content\*  
1983-1984

	<u>January-September 1983</u>			<u>October 1983-September 1984</u>		
	<u>Total Papers</u>	<u>Interdisciplinary Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Total Papers</u>	<u>Interdisciplinary Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
ALA	52	19	37	53	36	68
EURA	41	19	32	57	30	53
NESA	52	19	31	73	29	40
OEA	53	21	46	59	28	47
OGI	84	23	24	100	64	64
SOVA	60	21	33	62	15	24
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	342	122	36	404	202	50

---

\* Only the offices listed were covered in the 1983 survey.

SECRET

Table 3  
Mix of 1984 Papers That Were Interdisciplinary When Submitted

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Pol., Econ. &amp; Mil.</u>	<u>Pol. &amp; Econ.</u>	<u>Pol. &amp; Mil.</u>	<u>Other Combinations of 3 Disciplines</u>	<u>Geog. Plus One Other</u>	<u>Biog. Plus One Other</u>	<u>Pol. and Psycholo- gical</u>	<u>Econ. Plus One Other</u>	<u>Tech. Plus One Other</u>
ALA	36	18	14	4	-	-	-	-	-	-
EURA	30	4	17	9	-	-	-	-	-	-
NESA	29	8	11	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
OEA	28	3	18	6	-	-	-	-	1	1
SOVA	15	2	5	8	-	-	-	-	-	-
OGI	64	8	15	5	9	9	-	4	13	1
OSWR	11	-	-	-	2	-	-	3	-	6
OIA	19	2	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	9
OCR	20	-	-	-	3	-	17	-	-	-
	<u>252</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>17</u>

SECRET



Table 4  
1984 Papers  
Which Would Have Benefited  
From a More Interdisciplinary Approach

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Identified by</u>		<u>Weak or Missing Element*</u>		
		<u>ODDI</u>	<u>PES</u>	<u>Political</u>	<u>Economic</u>	<u>Military</u>
ALA	7	3	4	3	2	2
EUR	6	1	5	3	3	-
NESA	13	6	7	6	7	1
OEA	11	-	11	7	4	1
SOVA	5	2	3	5	-	-
OGI	7	3	4	4	5	-
OSWR	7	1	6	3	2	4
OIA	18	2	16	13	-	9
OCR	4	2	2	2	2	-
	<u>78</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>17</u>

---

\* Numbers may add to more than the total because more than one element was missing in individual papers.

SECRET

Table 5

Mix of Appropriately Single Discipline Papers  
in 1984

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Pol.</u>	<u>Econ.</u>	<u>Mil.</u>	<u>Tech.</u>	<u>Bioq.</u>	<u>Geog.</u>
ALA	10	6	1	3	-	-	-
EURA	21	16	4	1	-	-	-
NESA	31	24	3	4	-	-	-
OEI	20	9	9	2	-	-	-
SOVA	42	-	15	27	-	-	-
OGI	29	7	14	-	-	-	8
OSWR	30	-	-	-	30	-	-
OIA	21	-	1	10	10	-	-
OCR	3	1	1	-	-	1	-
	<u>207</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8</u>

SECRET

ALA

This survey covers 87 ALA papers reviewed in the DI front office between October 1983 and the end of August 1984--53 formal papers and 34 typescripts.

Of the formal papers, we found that fully two-thirds (36 papers) had substantial interdisciplinary content as originally submitted, three were remanded by the ODDI because they were judged inadequate on this basis, and four others would have benefited from more injection of interdisciplinary content. Ten were single-discipline papers fully justified by the nature of the subject matter and the intensity of the research effort being undertaken.

- Half of the 36 interdisciplinary papers combined consideration of political, economic and military factors.
- The bulk of the others (14 to be exact) were political-economic papers.
- Four were political-military in nature.

The 10 papers that appeared to be appropriate as single-discipline papers included six on political topics, three on military ones, and only one economic issuance--a statistical review [redacted] Of the nine political and economic papers, seven dealt with [redacted] clearly topics that are worthy of detailed research on specialized topics. The two remaining papers were on the [redacted] [redacted]--again significant subjects worth investigating. Moreover, subsequent papers have been done on both countries that readily qualify as interdisciplinary.

25X1  
25X1

25X1  
25X1

Turning to the three papers that were remanded by the ODDI for inclusion of additional material, all emerged as political-military papers. Two had begun as primarily military papers [redacted] that needed more treatment of political considerations and implications. On the other hand a paper on [redacted] gave insufficient consideration to military factors.

25X1

25X1

Our survey turned up four other papers that were basically good papers but could have benefited from a broader approach.

- A paper on [redacted] would have been more useful and relevant if it had included more comprehensive treatments of government policy and of economic factors.

25X1

SECRET

SECRET

-- A paper on [ ] dealt with what was received, from whom, and the political motives of the suppliers, but not with the impact of the materiel on the military capabilities of the insurgents.

25X1

-- Two papers [ ] were published a week apart [ ] that seemed unnecessarily narrow. [ ] both papers stand on their own merits. But the simultaneous publication does look a little strange--especially when a check of the Research Program shows that they were planned that way all along.

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

Of the seven formal papers that might be considered problems with regard to disciplinary mix, five were single-author papers and only one involved a contribution from another office (OIA, in this case). There may be a message here, in that 28 of the 36 papers that were interdisciplinary when submitted for review involved more than one author and almost half (15) included contributions from other offices.

We did not uncover any problems with the disciplinary mix in ALA typescripts. More than half (21) were at least nominally interdisciplinary--12 covered all three primary disciplines, five dealt with political-economic topics and four were political-military in content. A lot of these were essentially "staple jobs"--for example, nine Central America monthly publications and three [ ] but the summaries did a satisfactory (and in the case of [ ] improving) job of drawing the threads together. And a number of the others were quite sophisticated.

25X1  
25X1

The 13 typescripts that were unidisciplinary seemed appropriately so. Seven were on political topics, and there were three each on military and economic subjects. No doubt some of them could have been broadened somewhat--but not necessarily with any particular benefit to the intended consumers.

There does not appear to be any major difference between the three divisions in ALA insofar as interdisciplinary content is concerned.

SECRET

## EURA

The following remarks are based on a survey of 86 EURA papers reviewed in the DI front office between 1 October 1983 and the end of August 1984-- 57 formal papers and 29 typescripts.

Of the formal papers, more than half (30) had substantial interdisciplinary content as originally submitted, one was remanded by the DI front office in part because of a deficiency in this regard, and five would have benefited from greater interdisciplinary emphasis. Twenty-one were appropriately cast as single-discipline papers by virtue of the subject matter covered and the intended audience.

More than half (17) of the formal interdisciplinary papers were political-economic in nature. Nine took a political-military approach. Four dealt with political, economic, and military factors together.

Of the 21 appropriately unidisciplinary formal projects, 16 had a political focus, four emphasized economics, and one had a military orientation. Six of these papers dealt [redacted] long a subject of detailed work on specialized topics. Three dealt with subsets of the global terrorism cross-cutting theme. The rest were "building block" pieces on subjects that regularly get broad-brush treatment.

25X1

The one formal paper remanded by the DI front office for its lack of interdisciplinary content started out as primarily a political study, looking ahead to [redacted] It was deemed weak on economics.

25X1

We found five formal papers that, while basically sound pieces, would have benefited from greater interdisciplinary content. Two were essentially political papers--one covering [redacted] the other on [redacted]--that lacked sufficient attention to economic factors. The other three were East European economic studies--two country papers and one regional piece--that did not adequately treat the political ramifications of the problem being discussed.

25X1  
25X1

Of the six formal papers that might be considered problems with regard to disciplinary mix, five were single-author projects, and only one included a contribution from another DI component. By contrast, nearly half (13) of 30 formal papers with sufficient interdisciplinary content had more than one author, and about a quarter (seven) had contributions from other offices.

SECRET

The disciplinary mix of the 29 EURA typescripts was good. Nearly half (14) were adequately interdisciplinary--seven had a political-economic focus, six were political-military in nature, and one covered all three primary disciplines. The 15 unidisciplinary papers seemed appropriately cast. In most cases the narrow focus seems to have reflected the needs of the consumer.

Overall, 51 percent (44) of the 86 EURA papers reviewed had adequate interdisciplinary content. European Issues Division proved the most adept--though only by a narrow margin--at producing interdisciplinary work. EI produced 41 percent (18) of EURA's total in this category and put out none of the papers we found to lack interdisciplinary content. Western Europe Division ran a close second, turning out 39 percent (17) of EURA's total of interdisciplinary papers but publishing two of the six "problem" papers. EE Division was a distant third, claiming credit for 18 percent (eight) of the interdisciplinary projects but producing four of the single-discipline papers that we thought should have been broader.

SECRET

## NESA

This survey covers 88 NESA papers reviewed in the DI front office between October 1983 and the end of August 1984--73 formal papers and 21 typescripts.

Of the formal papers, we found that a little over 40 percent (29 papers) had significant interdisciplinary content when submitted to O/DDI. Of the 12 papers remanded for a variety of reasons, six were criticized by O/DDI for lacking a sufficiently interdisciplinary approach--three for the addition of political aspects of the issues, two for economic input, and one for a combination of military and economic questions. Thirty-eight of the 67 formal papers are essentially single-discipline in substance; 31 of these seem entirely justified as such because of the subject matter addressed and the focus of the research effort, but seven papers would have benefited somewhat from a more interdisciplinary approach.

- Well over one-third (eight) of the 29 interdisciplinary papers combined a consideration of political, economic, and military factors.
- Of the remaining 21 papers, 11 were political-economic in orientation, and 10 were political-military.

The 31 single-discipline papers which we found completely appropriate included 24 on political topics, four on military matters, and three on economic issues. Of the seven that we believe would have benefited from a more interdisciplinary approach, three were on political and four on economic subjects. In contrast, of 14 formal papers that we found to be of unusually high quality, all but three--exclusively political in approach--were interdisciplinary in content.

The largest number of papers with a single focus--the 24 political papers--are justified because the topics were clearly identified as single issue and were inherently worthy of an intensive investigation for the purpose of applying the research to larger issues in other more comprehensive papers. (Examples of such single-issue, political papers include:

25X1

25X1

In any event, countries treated in single-issue papers also have been the subject of papers that qualify as interdisciplinary.

25X1

SECRET

SECRET

As for the seven published papers that would have been improved through a more interdisciplinary approach:

- [redacted] although otherwise 25X1  
a useful memo, would have been improved by placing the search in a political/economic context of likely reactions by possible donors.
- [redacted] while 25X1  
an excellent paper, would have been even more useful if an evaluation of the effect of economic and political realities on [redacted] 25X1  
political matters had been included.
- [redacted] while providing a good 25X1  
description of economic deterioration, did not relate this to the likely [redacted] efforts to reverse the situation. 25X1
- [redacted] 25X1  
[redacted] focused on the effects of population growth and did not 25X1  
deal with possible/probable countervailing forces; therefore the context for the problem seems too narrow.
- [redacted] described the 25X1  
problems of the transportation network into the South but did not analyze the economic implications.
- [redacted] provided a full description 25X1  
of the different [redacted] and their problems, but was 25X1  
more a reference aid than an assessment in that the longer-term political implications, including those bearing on Soviet interests, were not developed.
- [redacted] is a persuasive description 25X1  
of the political problems of the opposition but does not handle the impact of economic developments [redacted] on these prospects. 25X1

Regarding the authorship of the 67 formal papers, 37 were by a single analyst and the remainder by two or more writers. Of those by one author, 21 could be considered unidisciplinary and 16 multidisciplinary; of those by two or more authors, 17 are unidisciplinary and 13 multidisciplinary. Finally, of the total of 29 multidisciplinary papers, 11 included contributions from other offices, six from OGI--one of which also received a contribution from OIA--and five from OCR. In other words, the proportion of single to multidisciplinary papers in NESAs is very similar regardless of the number of analysts involved in producing a paper. This suggests that NESAs has a relatively high

SECRET



proportion of analysts able to do multidisciplinary analysis; it also suggests that the design of the Research Program encourages an unnecessarily high proportion of one-discipline papers.

Of the seven formal papers that might have been improved through a more multidisciplinary approach, five were single author papers; two did include contributions from OCR, but the nature of the contribution-- material--does not tend to make political papers more multidisciplinary.

25X1

Regarding typescripts, of the 21 reviewed by the O/DDI about half were interdisciplinary, with 12 being produced by one analyst and the remainder by two or more; there is no statistical significance regarding number of authors and whether single or multidisciplined.

SECRET

## OEA

These comments are based on a survey of 135 OEA papers reviewed in the DI front office between 1 October 1983 and the end of August 1984--59 formal papers and 76 typescripts.

Of the formal papers, just under half (28) had substantial interdisciplinary content as originally submitted for review, while 11 would have benefited from greater attention to this matter. Twenty of the formal papers were single-discipline efforts which seemed appropriately cast given their intent and audience.

The bulk of the formal interdisciplinary papers (18) were political-economic in nature. Six had a political-military focus. Three covered all three primary disciplines, and one dealt with economic and technical issues.

The 20 papers that appeared to be appropriate as single-discipline studies included nine on political topics, nine economic studies, and two military projects. Nearly half of the 20 dealt [redacted] an obvious candidate for in-depth research on specialized topics; two each concerned [redacted] countries on which wrap-up pieces are regularly done. The remainder reflected "building-block" or "capital-building" research.

25X1

25X1

No OEA paper was remanded by the DI front office for lack of interdisciplinary content. PES did, however, identify 11 papers that--while basically sound--could have benefited from a broader approach. The four political papers in this category needed an injection of economic analysis--one needed treatment of the military dimension, as well. The six economic papers and the one military study lacked adequate treatment of the broader policy implications of the points made and the questions raised.

Of the 11 "problem papers" noted, ten were single-author papers, and none included contributions from other offices. By contrast, 13 of the formal papers with significant interdisciplinary content as submitted (46 percent) had more than one author, while five had the benefit of contributions from other components.

Regarding OEA typescripts, we found the disciplinary mix quite satisfactory. Some 40 percent of the 76 papers in this category (31 to be precise) were interdisciplinary to a significant degree--15 had a political-economic focus, 11 were political-military in nature, and five covered all three major disciplines. Forty-two of the informal papers were appropriately

SECRET

unidisciplinary in nature--the majority were tailored to a specific consumer. Only three of the single-discipline typescripts could, in our judgment, have benefited from a more interdisciplinary approach.

Looking at OEA's production overall, the Northeast Asia Division proved somewhat more adept at producing interdisciplinary analysis than the other two divisions in the office. NED produced 25 of the papers we deemed to have sufficient interdisciplinary content and put out only three that were deficient in this regard (an 8:1 ratio). The Southeast Asia Division ranked second, turning out 26 interdisciplinary pieces but six "problem" papers, as well (a 4 1/2:1 ratio). China Division came in last, with 13 interdisciplinary papers and four papers deficient in this regard (a 3:1 ratio).

SECRET

**SECRET**

25X1

## INDEX

SECRET

bearing on the interdisciplinary issue (e.g., presentational shortcomings, evidential base, etc.).

Our survey turned up three other papers that basically were good ones, but in our view would have benefited from a broader approach.

- A paper dealing with the [redacted] should have treated the political problems its creation generated [redacted] and the implications of this friction for readiness. 25X1 25X1 25X1
- One looking at the [redacted] would have been better if it had included a more detailed political discussion of the government's options to take measures that could boost the economy, even temporarily. 25X1
- [redacted] would have benefited from some discussion of how [redacted] as a means of policy leverage with consumers. 25X1 25X1

In these two latter instances, the ADDI suggested such additions but his comments appear to have been largely ignored.

Of the five formal papers that might be considered problems with regard to disciplinary mix, two were single-author papers, two were papers with contributions from analysts working the same discipline (economists), and only one had multiple authors involving more than one office. Our PRR data does not allow us to determine whether the latter effort was a multi-author and multi-office paper from the outset, or after the DDI remanded it for additional material. These instances aside, however, SOVA willingness to involve itself in joint projects ranks high in comparison with some other DI components.

In the typescript category we judged 40 percent (six of 15) of the memos to be interdisciplinary--four on political-military issues, one political-economic paper, and one covering all three disciplines. Three of the political-military typescripts dealt with [redacted] issues; the fourth dealt with the politically and militarily sensitive issue of [redacted]

[redacted] The political-economic paper examined the legal basis and economic significance (to the Soviets) of then [redacted] The final typescript in the interdisciplinary category was a scene setter that correctly foreshadowed likely developments at [redacted]

The nine single-discipline typescripts covered a variety of issues. Four of the papers dealt with military topics, another four with political subjects, and one economic report. Many of these typescripts could have been broadened somewhat--but not necessarily with any particular benefit to the intended consumers.

SECRET

## OGI

For OGI, we looked at 165 papers reviewed in the October-August period. Of these, 100 were formal papers and 65 were typescripts.

Even cursory review would have established fairly quickly that OGI deals in a wider range of interdisciplinary work than the rest of the DI. Here, convenient boxes such as political, military, and economic do not compass the product. Vulnerability studies on [ ] draw on economic, geographic, engineering, and--sometimes--military skills. Major efforts on industrial competitiveness, technology issues, and hydrocarbon development have entailed both economic and engineering analysis. [ ]

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

[ ] And there are some areas--aspects of terrorism, narcotics, and political instability are examples--where there is no clear connection to any one discipline and no real analogue in work outside the Agency.

On closer inspection, the impression of a distinctly interdisciplinary effort holds up well. Of the 100 formal papers we looked at, 64 were multidisciplinary to a reasonable degree when sent forward. Of these:

- A quarter (16 papers) involved analysis in three different disciplines.
- The remainder combined views from two disciplines (most frequently political/economic).

We found three formal papers that were remanded specifically to broaden their disciplinary content.

- One was a paper on [ ] that did not go far enough in considering the political ramifications of the program [ ]
- Another was an assessment of [ ] potential that was short on both market economics and domestic politics.
- The third was a [ ] paper that needed more political and economic context.

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

SECRET

We found 29 single discipline papers that posed no problems; over half were economic, about one-quarter were political (predominantly on narcotics and terrorism), and most of the rest were essentially on physical geography. The most frequent topics in the single discipline area were trade or energy related; typically, these were papers whose intent was to draw together and analyze data bases for people outside the Agency who do not have the same resources we do.

In addition, we found four papers that would have been more useful to the reader if they had been broader in disciplinary scope.

- A wrap-up paper on [redacted] 25X1  
[redacted] was short on the political objectives of the programs. 25X1
- An otherwise excellent paper on [redacted] 25X1  
would have benefited from some commentary on the economic implications of the patterns being analyzed.
- A joint OGI/NESA paper on the [redacted] 25X1  
[redacted] missed an opportunity to spell out how the 25X1  
stresses would present themselves to LDC governments by failing to include in the team an economist capable of analyzing the patterns of attendant resource constraints.
- A speculative paper on [redacted] came up short on dealing 25X1  
with the link to US trade/aid policy and the role of market participants because the author--a noneconomist--was on her own in sorting out unfamiliar patterns. (Oddly, this particular paper passed through a reviewing chain at the division and beyond that was made up of economists. If nothing else, this shows that good product review may not depend as much on training in the related discipline as on willingness to question and assist the author at an early stage.)

Among the seven "problem" papers--a small sample considering total office output--there is some evidence for the synergy of teams. Five of the seven had only one author and the same proportion drew on only one office in the research and drafting, while two were multiauthor, multioffice products. In contrast, almost 60 percent of the interdisciplinary papers involved more than one author.

Of the 34 formal papers we judged to be particularly well-integrated interdisciplinary work, exactly half involved more than one author. Quite a few of these papers were in the political/economic or economic/engineering areas. Somewhat more surprisingly, only one-third (11) of the papers in this well-integrated group involved contributions from other offices.

SECRET

SECRET

The typescript product of OGI shows many of the same broad characteristics in terms of interdisciplinary content as the formal papers, but the proportion of items that clearly draw on more than one field is appreciably smaller. For the 11-month period, 55 percent of the typescripts (36 versus 29 papers) were single-discipline. But this share seems to be declining as some of the newer accounts of OGI are better integrated into the office and the trend toward more infusion of political perspective into the economic product continues; in the most recent eight months, half the typescripts were interdisciplinary.

The single-discipline typescripts that we encountered generally appeared justified in that mode based on the requesters' needs or the purpose stated in the covering memos. Some could have been richer products if OGI had widened their scope. Quite a few, however, were responses to requests for data bases or for work in narcotics and terrorism that would not have benefited much from the artificial infusion of additional material.

It seemed to us in reviewing the OGI product that the greatest risks of insularity were in the energy, physical geography, and international trade areas. Though energy analysis often involves inputs from economics, geology, and engineering, the effort that goes into building up this mixed expertise may lead the energy analyst to conclude erroneously that country analysts--usually not prepared to discuss the technical questions of production--do not have a useful input to make on domestic demand or policy questions. The problem in the physical geography area is that research traditions in the discipline, consumers' requests, and the format of the product often direct the analyst away from considering new approaches that might include soliciting inputs from others. Similar difficulties deriving from tradition and practice haunt the international trade field; typically, consumers separate policy patterns and data bases in their discussions, and it is easy to reply in kind. There was some scattered evidence in what we looked at that these problems had affected bits and pieces of the OGI product, but the incidence was small.

SECRET



OSWR

This survey covers 48 formal OSWR papers and three typescripts reviewed in the DI front office between October 1983 and the end of August 1984.

Of the formal papers, we judged eight to have substantial interdisciplinary content as originally submitted; three others that contained a significant blend of technical military analysis with some discussion of the impact on force operations. Counting these latter projects as interdisciplinary, OSWR's total in this category climbs to 11. We judged 30 single-discipline papers to be largely or totally justified by the nature of the research undertaken and the audience for which they were intended. All were technical papers; they covered a range of issues from weapons systems to nuclear power.

Of 12 the interdisciplinary papers:

- Three combined consideration of political, economic and technical factors;
- Another three were military-technical in content;
- Three more addressed [ ] topics; and
- The final three were economic-technical in nature.

25X1

Ten of the interdisciplinary papers had more than one author and six papers involved more than one office. Only one paper, a look at [ ] was remanded by the DDI because of the disciplinary content; he judged the political and economic discussion to be fragmentary, unfocused and somewhat superficial. In 11 other instances, however, the DDI or ADDI requested revisions or more sharply focused key judgments to spell out more clearly the policy implications of certain papers. This suggests to us that, while OSWR is trying hard to undertake policy-relevant, multidisciplinary projects, the office is still uncomfortable in working with some of this material.

25X1  
25X1

We identified six single-discipline papers that in our view could have benefited from additional interdisciplinary content:

- A paper dealing with [ ] that could have used more discussion political and economic objectives, and potential customers;

25X1

SECRET

SECRET

- A paper looking at the impact of [redacted] that begged for  
some discussion of the strategic significance of [redacted]  
[redacted] 25X1  
25X1  
25X1  
25X1
- A paper assessing [redacted] that would have been more useful had it contained some discussion of  
political motivations and policy goals [redacted] 25X1  
[redacted] 25X1
- [redacted] that would have benefited from  
some discussion of [redacted] 25X1  
[redacted] 25X1
- [redacted] that could have used more  
discussion of [redacted] 25X1  
[redacted] 25X1
- [redacted] that would have benefited from  
a larger SOVA input on [redacted] 25X1  
[redacted] 25X1  
[redacted] 25X1  
(The fact that  
SOVA coordinated this paper, and two weeks later published a paper of  
its own that contradicted some of the conclusions of the OSWR paper,  
suggests that at least part of the problem lies in SOVA.)

In the last instance, the DDI requested that the IA version of this TIR be done jointly with SOVA and address operational implications of the deployment of this aircraft on Soviet military capabilities. Only two of the six "problem" papers involved more than one author and more than one office.

25X1

SECRET

SECRET

## OIA

The following remarks are based on a survey of 82 papers received by PES between 1 October 1983 and the end of August 1984--58 formal papers and 24 typescripts (or the equivalent). Only 22 of these were reviewed in the DI front office.

Of the formal papers, 19 (33 percent) had substantial interdisciplinary content as sent forth from the office, two (four percent) were remanded by the DI front office for lack of such content, and 16 (28 percent) would have benefited from a more interdisciplinary approach. Twenty-one of the formal papers (36 percent) were appropriately cast as single-discipline studies.

Nearly half (nine) of the interdisciplinary papers were military-technical in nature. Nine were political-military. Two were political-military-economic, and one was political-economic.

Of the 21 single-discipline formal papers that "worked," 10 dealt with S&T topics, 10 were military in nature, and one had an economic focus. Virtually all of the 21 papers were technical, "building-block" projects, reflecting useful research on topics with longer-range significance and on which OIA and other DI elements regularly publish broad-brush, interdisciplinary papers.

Both formal papers remanded by the DI front office for insufficient interdisciplinary content fell short in the political dimension. One had started out as an economic paper on [redacted] the other as an essentially military study of [redacted]

25X1  
25X1

The sixteen formal papers we labelled as deficient in interdisciplinary content fell into three categories:

- Five papers with immediate bearing on [redacted]  
[redacted] All failed to state how the matter under consideration might change [redacted] thinking about [redacted]
- Eight papers dealing with Third World topics [redacted]  
[redacted] Six lacked a needed political dimension and five were short of military analysis (that is, some were deficient in both regards).

25X1  
25X1  
25X1  
25X125X1  
25X1

SECRET

SECRET

- Three papers on other topics that lacked either political or military implications.

Of the 18 formal papers that might be considered problems with respect to their disciplinary mix, 14 were single-author papers, and only two had the benefit of contributions from other offices. By contrast, all but one of the 19 papers that were interdisciplinary as originally sent out by OIA included contributions from other offices.

None of OIA's 24 typescripts was interdisciplinary. Sixteen of these seemed appropriately unidisciplinary, being "building-block" studies on military or S&T topics. The remaining eight could have used input from other DI components. These mostly dealt with front-burner, policy-related questions but lacked any treatment of the implications for policy.

Viewed overall, 23 percent (19) of the 82 OIA papers surveyed were notable for their interdisciplinary content. Forty-five percent (37) were appropriately cast as single-discipline studies, 32 percent (26) inappropriately. The 19 interdisciplinary papers came in almost equal numbers from four of the five divisions in OIA. Only the Missile Systems Division produced none. Of the 26 papers we judged lacking in interdisciplinary content, over 40 percent (11) originated in the Third World Forces Division. Nearly 20 percent (five) came from the Missile Systems Division.

SECRET

OCR

25X1

Evaluating the interdisciplinary mix of the OCR product presents distinctive problems. The most important medium for OCR work is the

25X1

[redacted] For most of the [redacted] a year undertaken for a wide audience, the consumers do not want or expect OCR to engage in traditional political, military, or economic analysis. On the other hand, we feel there is a clear record of improvement in OCR's formal papers in terms of complexity and sophistication over the past few years, and this has depended on more analysis of political and economic processes and decisionmaking.

25X1

To deal with the unusual character of the OCR product, we chose to treat [redacted] as a discipline and to look at the instances in which the analysts were extending their work based on data from other fields. To do this, we inspected the product record on 27 analytic papers reviewed during October 1983-August 1984. Since there were only two substantive typescripts [redacted] we did not attempt to draw any conclusions in that area.

25X1

In this set of 27 formal papers, we found 20 that were interdisciplinary when sent forward for review and two that were remanded on this score.

-- Three combined [redacted] analysis.

25X1

-- Most (17 papers) pulled together analysis from two disciplines

25X1

Two of OCR's formal publications were remanded by the DDI/ADDI to broaden their disciplinary scope.

-- [redacted] was judged too weak on political context and process.

25X6

-- [redacted] and future jockeying was found--despite the laying out of some scenarios--to be too thin in political analysis.

25X6

Only five papers could legitimately be classified as single-discipline papers when published. Of these, three seemed entirely appropriate [redacted]

25X1

25X1

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

We found two other papers, however, that would have been better with inputs from other disciplines.

- An interesting and timely [redacted] mentioned economic problems as significant worries [redacted] but did not develop this reasoning or explain [redacted]

25X1  
25X1  
25X1  
25X1

- A paper on the [redacted] provided little or no context on the global market for [redacted] or on the [redacted]

25X1  
25X1  
25X1

The set of five "problem" papers is by itself a slender reed on which to base any theories about cooperation as a means to better product. Still, the numbers seem to be consistent with the patterns in other offices: three of the four were single-author papers, only one (a joint effort) included a substantial contribution from another component.

Numbers alone do not adequately show the ways in which interdisciplinary work has been improving in OCR. OCR analysts have been making more effective use of resources in other parts of the DI, as is evident in the fact that 10 truly joint papers were undertaken in the first eight months of 1984 compared with one in the last three months of 1983. Meanwhile, the sophistication of political analysis from [redacted] base has improved considerably. Especially encouraging is work being done on second-generation leadership in the Third World and political organization/processes below the national level in key countries.

25X1

SECRET